

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-13 are currently pending in the subject application.

Pending independent claim 8, as amended, recites a method for real-time online search processing of shopping requests received from a wireless handheld client in a received native language. XML is used in the communication between the wireless handheld client and a remote server. An offline database maintains information about a plurality of vendor sites, including URL's, search form URL's, description of domains, and vendor descriptions. The plurality of vendor sites include vendor sites in different native languages, and the maintained information for each of the plurality of vendor sites includes information in the native language of that vendor site. The vendor descriptions include generalized results about how product information is organized on each of the plurality of vendor sites. A product keyword request, received from the wireless handheld device in the received native language, is processed, including using the vendor descriptions to identify ones of the plurality of vendor sites which may have information responsive to and in the received native language of the product keyword request, and using the search form URL's. Real-time price and product information in the received native language are extracted from the identified vendor sites, and the extracted price and product information are communicated to the wireless handheld device.

Claim 8 has been amended to clarify that the "requests" received from the client are "in a received native language," that the plurality of vendor sites for which information is maintained each have a native language and include vendor sites in different native languages," and that the maintained information for each of the "plurality of" vendor sites includes "information in the native language for that vendor site." The "processing a product keyword request" element has been amended to recite that the product keyword request is "in the received native language," and to clarify that the processing includes "using" the search form URL's. The "extracting real-time and product information" element has been amended to clarify that the extracted information are in the "received native language." Support for these amendments can be found, for

example, in paragraphs 0152 and 0160 of the published version of the subject application.

Claim 11 has been amended to clarify that the delimiter patterns comprise code and native language character strings. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph 0152 of the published version of the subject application, for example.

Rejection of claims 8, 10-13 under 35 USC 103(a):

In the Final Office Action mailed May 18, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 10-13 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Gottsman et al. (US 6,134,548) in view of Floyd (PTO-892, Item: U) and PRN (PTO-892, Item: V). It is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 8, and dependent claims 10-13, as ultimately dependent from claim 8, are allowable over Gottsman et al, in view of Floyd and PRN.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Gottsman et al. do not disclose communicating with the wireless handheld client through a remote server using XML, or in a native language of the accessed vendor sites. (See Office Action, pages 3 and 4.) Further more, Gottsman et al. do not teach, suggest or make obvious, at least the following features recited in amended claim 8:

1. maintaining in an offline database, information about of plurality of vendor sites each having a native language and including vendor sites in different native languages, and in which the maintained information includes information in the native language for each vendor site; and
2. processing a product keyword request (received from a wireless handheld client in a received native language) by using the stored vendor descriptions to identify ones of the plurality of vendor sites which may have information responsive to “and in the received native language of” the product keyword request, using the “search form URL’s, and extracting real-time price and product information from the identified ones of the plurality of vendor sites, wherein the extracted information are “in the received native language.”

It is respectfully submitted that neither Gottsman et al., nor the Floyd reference, nor the PRN reference, disclose maintaining in an offline database, information about a plurality of vendor sites each having a native language and including vendor sites in different native languages, and in which the maintained information includes information in the native language for each vendor site, and in which a product keyword request from the wireless handheld client in the received native language is processed by identifying ones of the plurality of vendor sites which may have information responsive to “and in the received native language of” the product keyword request, and then using the search form URL’s extracting real-time price and product information in the received native language.

Gottsman et al. do not teach operating with a plurality of vendor sites including vendor sites in different native languages. The Examiner has cited PRN as teaching “multi-lingual functionality which includes up to 16 languages and 23 countries, and enabling CNET customers to deliver locally focused (i.e. native language) information on a global scale (V: see pages 1 and 2).” See Final Office action at pages 3 and 6. However, the preceding sentence in the PRN reference states “The service catalogs more than 400,000 product SKU’s worldwide, and continues to add thousands more each week.” (Emphasis added.) Thus, it is clear that the information provided by such service is not “real-time.” Further, the “up to 16 languages in 23 countries” phrasing in the PRN reference, does not indicate or suggest that the manner in which the “locally focused” information is obtained and delivered is through the process recited in amended claim 8 – namely, through maintaining in an offline database, information about a plurality of vendor sites each having a native language and including vendor sites in different native languages, and in which the maintained information includes information in the native language for each vendor site, and through processing a product keyword request by identifying vendor sites that may have information responsive to and in the received native language of the product keyword request, and using search form URLs, and through extracting real-time price and product information in the received native language from those identified vendor sites.

Application Serial No. 10/810,432
Response date July 24, 2007
Reply to Final Office Action dated May 18, 2007

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 8 is allowable over Gottsman et al., Floyd and PRN; and that claims 10-13, as ultimately dependent from allowable base claim 8, are also allowable.

Rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a):

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Gottsman et al. (US 6,134,548) in view of Floyd (PTO-892, Item: U) and PRN (PTO-892, Item: V), as applied to claim 8, further in view of Pricegrabber (Paper #20050610, PTO-892, Item: UU).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable as dependent from allowable claim 8.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance, and the Examiner's indication to that end is respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER US LLP

Date: July 24, 2007

By:



Gerald T. Sekimura
Reg. No. 30,103

DLA PIPER US LLP
153 Townsend Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: 415-836-2500
Facsimile: 415-836-2501

Customer No. 29585